### T

A. Interpretation: The aff must defend only the aims of a living wage-*not* the implementation.

B. Violations: 1. He said in CX he defended implementation of the aff-you can’t do that under my interp. 2. None of the AC offense is aimed based-it’s all about what would happen if their policy was implemented.

C. Standards:

1. Philosophical education. My interp allows us to focus the entire debate on ethics. Implementation kills phil education because A. We spread ourselves thin and can’t cover the standards debate in depth and B. Implementation encourages the neg to just concede the aff standard and read turns. Philosophical education is key to education and outweighs policymaking because A. Normativity guides our everyday lives whereas not everyone wants to be policymakers, B. We can learn how to become philosophers in the real world. Most of us will go to college and many will have to understand ethics for those classes but next to none of us will become actual policymakers. C. Phil education is the only form of education unique to LD—you can get amazing policymaking education if you compete in policy or even PF. D. Phil education is a prerequisite to policymaking because ethics determine what counts as a benefit of a policy in the first place. E. The last two topics were insanely implementation oriented so aims is key to diversity of education. F. Empirical discussions of wage laws are useless-the resolution is fundamentally a question of autonomy vs. equity.

Gilmer Lee Gilmer (article is final paper of PVS‐ 101 at Furman University) “Minimally Adequate? Reassessing the Role of the Minimum Wage in the 21st Century” <http://www.furman.edu/academics/pvs/research/Documents/Lee%20Gilmer.%20minimum%20wage,%20living%20wage.pdf> pg. 13 JW 12/6/14

There are no clear empirical answers to the problems presented by the existence of a minimum wage. If there were, the issue would have been settled long ago. The very fact that it has not been settled speaks to its political volatility and the conflicting ideologies marshaled in support of both its defense and its elimination. In sum, we are faced with a decision between two conflicting value systems: one, the reigning paradigm of autonomy and liberalism and the other, one of fairness and equity. Thus the attempt at indexing the minimum wage to inflation is nothing more than piecemeal solution on the road to a more just and fair society; we must be willing to fundamentally restructure the nature of work and compensation under neoliberal capitalism.

2. Predictable limits. There is no unified methodology in the literature for calculating specific living wages-only agreement on what the aim of living wage is.

BSR 11 “Why Is Living Wage So Complex?” August 2nd 2011 <http://www.bsr.org/en/our-insights/bsr-insight-article/why-is-living-wage-so-complex>

The concept of a living wage dates back to the beginning of the industrial revolution and the creation of wage-based economies. Even Henry Ford was concerned that his workers be compensated well enough to be able to afford the products his company was making. In its most basic form, a living wage allows an individual or family to purchase the goods and services necessary to support physical survival, i.e., food, shelter, and clothing. A more robust and meaningful definition includes those items that are considered customary to have at lower income levels in the particular society, such as transportation, education, health care, leisure, and savings. Although many experts would agree that it’s best to frame the concept in terms of a market basket of goods and services, there is disagreement as to the inclusion of particular items. These disputes become more pointed when experts consider the applicability of a living wage across countries because the definition of what constitutes acceptable living standards is not only specific to the cultures of different countries, but also to their levels of economic development and the nature and provision of their social services. What constitutes a reasonable standard of living may vary by country, city, and even down to the family unit. Opinions also vary with respect to the most effective way to calculate and measure the value of these goods and services.

There are too many ways to implement a living wage.

BSR 2 “Why Is Living Wage So Complex?” August 2nd 2011 <http://www.bsr.org/en/our-insights/bsr-insight-article/why-is-living-wage-so-complex>

Calculation methodology: There are a variety of ways to calculate a living wage, including costing out a market basket of goods and services that are normally consumed by residents in a particular area. These items typically include housing, transportation, food, energy, education, and health care. From a per capita basis, the cost is then scaled up to reflect the average household size. Another approach is referential: A living wage is equivalent to 125 percent of the official poverty line or 50 percent of the average wage in manufacturing. And some calculations (the “London Living Wage”) rely on a mix of the market basket and reference approaches. More complex is to base the calculation on the cost of a model food diet across two expenditure groups (the Anker methodology). Finally, some stakeholders argue that living wage figures should be established through negotiation among the relevant parties at the appropriate operational level. Scope of application: A key issue is determining which employees will be “covered” by a living wage: Will it be just direct, full-time employees from all countries, or will it also cover part-time and temporary workers, contractors’ employees that work on the company’s premises, or some combination of the above? Also important is whether there will be one living wage per country or variations by different regions or urban areas. Consultation with operating units: It is also important to consider the extent to which different parts of a company will have an opportunity to participate in the design process. For example, allowing foreign affiliates to challenge a living wage figure by providing countervailing evidence can enhance buy-in to the program and ensure more accurate wage estimations. If such participation is supported, a company will need to set criteria governing acceptable types of evidence such as collective bargaining agreements, government statistics, or private sector reports. Remediation process: When it is determined that worker pay is below the established living wage, the company needs to create clear guidelines governing what the appropriate entity (division, foreign affiliate, etc.) must do to correct the situation. Such guidelines should include a timeline for bringing the wage levels into compliance and the process for reporting the correction to the department administering the program.

Three impacts. A. key to fairness-affs will always have a structural advantage since they can pick any mechanism and get a huge prep advantage by making the AC economic and general benefits *unique* to that one policy B. kills my ability to engage in your position since I couldn’t predict-forces me to go for framework and generic Ks which kills topic discussion and turns your impacts. C. Limits are an independent voter-in a world with implementation I have to prep 100s of case negs and spend all my time doing that so I can’t hang out with my friends or go see a movie. Moreover, saying we can defend whole res AND implementation is nonsensical since we can’t actually have an implementation based debate if the aff doesn’t specify a mechanism-obviously the consequences of the policy are dependent on what the policy is in the first place.

3. Resolvability-consequences are epistemically inaccessible so debating about them is infinitely regressive. A. Every consequence causes another consequence so there are an infinite number of consequences for any given action so we would never be able to tell if an action is consistent with your standard. B. In order to calculate consequences properly, an individual must also calculate the possibility of his own calculations being flawed, and the possibility of that calculation being wrong to infinity making objective calc impossible. Two implications: A. resolvability is key to fairness since every debate is a winner and the judge can’t pick one if we can’t evaluate the flow B. non uniques education-there is no implementation based education to be had since all discussion is 100% mooted by the fact it is completely false.

4. Textual accuracy. Defending implementation is inconsistent with the phrase “just governments” since they are an abstract concept by definition-it is an ideal but not something physical that is capable of passing real world policies which means a just government can only have aims. Two impacts A. link turns fairness and education since it’s the resolution is the basis for all burdens-only thing we have coming into the round. B. key to jurisdiction-you can’t endorse non topical affs since you are paid by the tournament to endorse one side of the resolution.

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses-if the round is skewed towards once debater you can longer test debate skill. 2. Education is a voter since it’s the end goal of debate and provides portable skills-also why schools fund debate in the first place. 3. Jurisdiction is a voter since if the aff isn’t topical it’s out of your jurisdiction to vote on it and you should default neg as I’m the only one with an advocacy. This also implies you evaluate T before theory since jurisdiction is the most important voter.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. I had to spend time reading T to check back abuse-dropping the arg means a portion of my 1nc is moot which kills fairness and education.

Competing interps since 1. Any brightline is arbitrary and bites judge intervention 2. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive under the given brightline 3. Competing interps forces a race to the top-an offense defense paradigm fosters good norms for the activity.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.